UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Positive Value of Death - - - - - - - - - *Herbert H. Stroup*

A Growing Pain? - - *Robert S. Hoagland*

The Mind of Thomas Jefferson - - - - - - - - - *Leonard B. Gray*

Labor and the Veteran - *David M. Bloch*

What Do We Mean By Progress? - - - - - - - - - *Wendell Thomas*

The Virus of Victory - *Stanton A. Coblentz*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXII NUMBER 2

Chicago, April, 1946

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

David M. Bloch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Stanton A. Coblentz: Well-known journalist and author.

Leonard B. Gray: Minister of the First Congregational Church, Lynn, Massachusetts; contributor of articles and poems to various journals.

Randall S. Hilton: Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference.

Robert S. Hoagland: Minister of the People's Liberal Church of Chicago.

Herbert H. Stroup: Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York.

Wendell Thomas: Author of *Hinduism Invades America* and *A Democratic Philosophy.* His latest book, *A Scientific Faith,* will be published this fall.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 19

ARTICLES—
- The Positive Value of Death—HERBERT H. STROUP 20
- A Growing Pain?—ROBERT S. HOAGLAND 21
- The Mind of Thomas Jefferson—LEONARD B. GRAY 22
- Labor and the Veteran—DAVID M. BLOCH 24
- What Do We Mean by Progress?—WENDELL THOMAS 26
- The Virus of Victory—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 28

POETRY—
- Ultimates—SHELDON SHEPARD 27
- Fog—GENEVIEVE K. STEPHENS 31

THE STUDY TABLE—
- Beginnings of Unitarianism—RANDALL S. HILTON 30

CORRESPONDENCE—
- Excellence Qualified—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 31
- Comments on "Our Too Masculine World"—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH 31

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 32

THE FIELD—
- An Encampment for Citizenship 18

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Encampment for Citizenship

The New York Society of the American Ethical Union is sponsoring a youth Encampment for a New Citizenship this summer. We feel that the citizenship which is needed in the days ahead must include and embody a much clearer sense of responsibility to meet the challenge of the times. This requires not only education in politics, economics, and international affairs, but also in ethical values and in a democratic way of life.

The young people who participated in the war, who were called to the colors by their nations to defend freedom, felt that they were needed, that they had a place, that they had a job to do. They now find themselves unemployed, disillusioned with the results of the war, and embittered by social conflicts—between racial and religious minorities, labor and management struggle, fear and hatred. This problem of democratic orientation and faith is not only that of the young veterans, but also of the teenage group, who are growing up in this period of conflict and confusion, and who will have to face their citizenship responsibility in the next five years.

The Encampment will consist of approximately 200 young people from seventeen to twenty-two years of age. They will be drawn from the 48 states. There will be young people from Mississippi and Alabama, as well as from Texas and Montana and Maine. There will be farm youth from the Cooperatives, the Farmers Union, the Four H Clubs, the Future Farmers of America. There will be young folks from the unions, both C.I.O. and A.F.L. There will be youth from the campuses of the colleges. There will be Negro and white, and perhaps Indian and Mexican and Japanese-American. There will be young veterans. It will be co-educational. Beyond that, the young people who will come to this Encampment will be of leadership quality: youth with energy, with brains, with initiative, and a capacity for influencing others. They will be chosen carefully, for accommodations are limited and only the most highly recommended with outstanding ability can be admitted.

This Institute or Encampment will last for six weeks, July 1st to August 10th, 1946. The living together of this diversified group, this cross-section of the American community, will itself be a rich experience in democracy. Beyond that, the cooperative study, self-government, cultural and recreational experiences will make for genuine growth. The most important part of the program will be the study and discussion of the chief issues which citizens must face in these next five years.

(*Continued on page* 30)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXXII APRIL, 1946 No. 2

EDITORIAL

It is good from time to time to remind ourselves of the principles that undergird the faith that is in us.

When we use the word "Unitarian," we mean "a movement fundamentally characterized . . . by its steadfastness and increasing devotion to these three leading principles: first, complete mental freedom in religion, rather than bondage to creeds or confessions; second, the unrestricted use of reason in religion, rather than reliance upon external authority or past tradition; third, generous tolerance of differing religious views and usages, rather than insistence upon uniformity in doctrine, worship, or polity."

This is what we mean, or what we should mean, when we say Unitarian—unless we wish to abandon the historical method in the interpretation of words and join Alice in a wonderland where we can make words mean precisely what we want them to mean, nothing more and nothing less.

On the authority of our historian, Earl Morse Wilbur, these principles—now publicized by the American Unitarian Association—are our heritage from four hundred years of Unitarian history. And it may be added confidently that they are our heritage from all the centuries in which great souls anywhere have struggled for freedom and reason and tolerance. We should regard them as a sacred trust.

I want to make a few observations that are reasonable implications of commitment to these principles and that are in general characteristic of Unitarian practice in America today.

A movement operating within the framework of these principles will as a matter of course have many confessions of faith, many statements of things commonly believed, and many sets of Five Points, but to none of them will it be in bondage. It will have many traditions —many King's Chapels and many Western Conferences—but upon none of them will it rely as authority. It will have a great variety of religious views and practices—Christian and non-Christian, theistic and humanistic, esthetic and ethical—but it will never insist on uniformity of beliefs and practices. It will have no recognized norm of belief and practice. It will encourage deviations from the prevailing beliefs and practices of any given time or place.

A movement operating within the framework of these principles will recognize only one heresy, namely, that of disloyalty to the principles themselves. No one can be excluded from such a movement save by the death of freedom in his own heart. What to do about the remains when freedom dies is a delicate question which we have not yet solved. Let it be said, however, that freedom and reason and tolerance are not by their nature bound to tolerate their own annihilation. I stress this point because I believe that the greatest hazard of any movement based on freedom is the tendency to tolerate those who seek the death of freedom itself. Neither a free church nor a free government is under any obligation to tolerate its own destruction.

A movement operating within the framework of these principles will encourage experiment in things religious, for it will know that these principles alone are not enough. They create the indispensable conditions of spiritual health and growth and maturity but they do not guarantee the ethical content which is the evidence of the validity of spiritual values, nor do they guarantee the social behavior which is the test of ethical living.

The sum of the matter is that we must implement these principles with wisdom gleaned from the prophets of all faiths, with knowledge derived from all fields of thought, and with the hope that leads us and the techniques that move us toward a just and a beautiful world for all mankind.

Some religious movement embodying these principles and dominated by prophetic insights will lead the world triumphantly into the new day. I claim that place of leadership and distinction for the Unitarian movement. I claim it by the spirit of the Channings, the Emersons, and the Parkers, whose names we honor. But that place of leadership will be ours only in case we have the vision to see the opportunities immediately ahead and the courage to seize them.

CURTIS W. REESE.

The Positive Values of Death

HERBERT H. STROUP

The coming of Easter each springtime places our attention on the possibility of everlasting life. But, even aside from Easter, our minds are constantly at battle with the thought of death, and our interests are ever self-assertive. Thus, we take care lest we be struck down on the street by a passing automobile. We watch our step when we climb to high places lest we fall. We are alert to many real and also to some unreal dangers which might enforce their death-creating potentialities over us.

Few of us look to death as a boon. It is a factor in human experience that we seek either to ignore or to minimize. Most of our home and religious training has influenced us to think of death as an unwanted and base experience, a thing to be feared. No man normally seeks out death any more than a man normally seeks out poverty. We judge the suicide as basically abnormal, for, we say, how could a normal person refuse the ultimate life-urging forces which are resident in our beings.

The experience of death, however, when correctly viewed, is as necessary to our physical, social, and spiritual selves as is nutrition or breathing in life. In fact, there are certain values about the death process which make it possibly a positive and creative experience for all men. While not all of the values of the death experience can be noted here, a few can be mentioned.

There can be no doubt but that the experience of death makes possible the continuance of life. Without great numbers of people dying, there could not be great numbers of people being born, growing up, maturing. While we have no statistical computations which indicate the state of world population should everyone who has been born have been denied death, nevertheless, it is apparent that there would be such numbers as to make life unbearably close and confining. Death, then, releases a certain "surplus" of the population, making for the better adjustment of those who live.

It is possible for a man growing old to keep himself ever alert to changing circumstances, but is difficult for most persons and seemingly impossible for many. Several empirical studies point out the common sense fact that as people grow older they tend to become more conservative; they wish to keep things as they are or have been. The young person, on the other hand, epitomizes novelty. Sometimes that is his limitation—he is full of novelty and short of the broadened experience which comes oftentimes with age. But, at any rate, he does have the desire of creating social and personal situations which will meet his qualifications and not those of another generation. It may be, as Vilfredo Pareto argued, that there are sets of underlying needs and drives which remain the same for all peoples, but that the outer aspects of their fulfillment (derivations) differ from generation to generation. In any case, youth and novelty are usually social concomitants. With the prospect of novelty genuinely established for human societies, we have a kind of guaranty that social progress is possible although not necessary. We hardly can imagine a social world in which the customs and beliefs which were original in various sections of the earth were maintained to this day.

There are powerful motivating factors present in all experience. Many of the motivations spring up without regard for the possibility of death. But it can scarcely be denied that death does impose a natural limitation on life which gives life a sense of definiteness and completion. We all feel the pressures of time-limitations. Otto Rank, the dissident follower of Freud, practically based his psychology upon this one factor chiefly. To him all experience is characterized by definite limits which simply have to be observed by the individual. We cannot expect to achieve limitless values in a limited, existential situation. The ability to accept one's limitations and make the most of them is certainly one of the marks of maturity. The limitations which death imposes make possible the sense of achievement in life without which life itself has little meaning. Thus Paul was able to say: "I have fought the good fight; I have kept the faith." Death, then, sets the limits by which we must seek to accomplish that for which we feel ourselves existing in the human scene.

While the great social movements and problems interest all normal people, and rightly so, the primary attachments in human experience are largely intimate and personal. We are essentially creatures of the family and in the family system we achieve our basic satisfactions. It follows, then, that the family is by nature a dynamic or changing social institution. What makes a family is not any static relationships which may exist between members, but the possibility of seeing young people grow up and get married. What a drab prospect it is to consider life without the parental experience of child-begetting. What a drab prospect for a society in which there would be no age distinctions. The fact that we are born, grow up, and die, makes our personal and social experience not only tolerable but also enriched. Sophia Fahs, the eminent religious educator of children, suggests that we tell children that death is a necessary experience in order that our life experience can thereby be enriched, and this seems to be wise counsel.

No one can saunter through life without the expectation that life's meaning will be summarized at death. The person who is unaware of the tremendous personal import of death for his own life has never known the deeper significance of living. For in death we all stand as equals. In death the shams of life which are so possible and so easily acceptable are crushed and life comes in contact with life's Essential Meaning. As long as death is an experience common to human beings, religion will always be needed, for religion is man's sincere desire for a final judgment of life's meaning and the promise of an infinite range of potential possibilities. Kierkegaard, the Danish theologian of another generation, has made this point luminous. He suggests that death is the chief experience engaging the mind of man which shatters his complacency, condemns his selfish strivings, and makes possible a transcendent evaluation of the meaning of personal existence.

Death, then, is not an unmitigated evil. It seems to be essential to mature, human life. Without it much of the value which we seek in life would be lessened or vanish. Death in itself is not to be feared as undesirable. It is to be recognized and accepted as being pivotal to a profound understanding of the nature of human nature and human destiny.

A Growing Pain?

ROBERT S. HOAGLAND

I have had adequate occasion, during the last year, to realize why some understanding soul made of two Greek words a very effective noun. The words are *nostos,* a return home, and *algia,* a pain. Several times, in recent months, I have experienced a disturbing variety of nostalgia. During a return home, I have several times passed, and at last have been forced by the *algia* to make a pilgrimage to, a "bend" in a lazy Ohio creek where, in the years of my boyhood, I fished hundreds of times. Freedom from chores and school, acres of flowers, green and knee-deep grass, the scent of the sweet locust in bloom, the sauciness of the red squirrel, the inimitable tang of wild raspberries, gently flowing water with its mellow tones, the luxurious touch of warm earth between bare toes, the friendliness of home after a day in the rich sun of early summer, add up to memories worthy of Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn. As I passed the bend in the creek, and the barbed thought that those gentle and gracious days are dead beyond recall jolted home, the memories totaled up to a constriction in the breast, a tingling in brain cells, a quickened pulse, which meant *nostos* plus *algia.*

This is a terrible, and yet a hauntingly sweet, feeling. Only a poet can do it justice.

There is an allied feeling, of the same overtones, which tortures countless thousands of religious people today. A poet, Helene Magaret, has done her nostalgia justice. Here are her words:

CHANGE OF SEASON

Often I lay light-hearted on some hill,
Giving my hair to grass, my feet to sod,
Letting the world wheel over me until,
Drunken with joy, I had no need of God;
Happy to hear the windy blackbirds wing
Over the corn, to see forsythia scatter
Like fallen stars beneath the feet of spring,
Happy believing God could never matter.

I did not know how soon the rising corn
Would stand with broken stalks, the blackbirds go,
Leaving the prairie desolate, forlorn
Before the long mortality of snow.
Heedless and young, I did not reckon then
How I would need my father's God again.

As I, with others, have felt nostalgia for a vanished boyhood, so have I, with others, felt nostalgia for a vanished God. At times I feel toward memories of the ringing conviction in the voice of Luther's preachers and towards the Lutheran sacrament of the Lord's Supper as I do toward my boyhood fishing hole. Yet I know, by metaphysical journeyings, by theological wrestlings, by the hard school of moral experience and by contact with those who profess such feelings as God-intoxication, that Luther's God is as lost to me as "the tender grace of a day that is dead."

At this announced junction of reality with theology some of the "religious" begin to shout: "You do not know how you will need your father's God again." Some actually still possess their father's God. But others merely echo William Ellery Leonard in his tortured *Two Lives:*

> "I kneeled with wringing hands and eyeballs hot
> Unto the God I knew existed not."

These latter are the bona fide God-nostalgia victims. Christopher Morley speaks for them in *Where the Blue Begins:*

> People who have had an arm or a leg amputated . . . . say that they still feel pains in the absent member. Well, there's an analogy in that. Modern skepticism has amputated God from the heart; but there is still a twinge where the arteries were sewn up.

Why deny the twinge? After all, even Pilar, the amazing woman of *For Whom the Bell Tolls,* exhibited this nostalgia, "There probably still is God after all although we have abolished Him."

The point is, this nostalgia is a very genuine and understandable pain. The relevant problem is: Where to, from it? Perhaps the most generous attitude toward its victims is one expressed in James Branch Cabell's notorious *Jurgen.* In Heaven Jurgen speaks to his God:

> I fear You, and, yes, I love You: and yet I cannot believe. . . . . God of my grandmother, I cannot quite believe in You, and Your doings as they are recorded I find incoherent and a little droll. But I am glad the affair has been so arranged that You may always now be real to brave and gentle persons who have believed in and have worshipped and have loved You. . . . I think of the dear people whose living was confident and glad because of their faith in You: I think of them, and in my heart contends a blind contrition, and a yearning, and an enviousness. . . . .

Jurgen decided to think his own thoughts and to let others think theirs. Opinions were very trifling things compared with very substantial values.

And why is not that the way it ought to be? Why should earnest people be attacked for their belief in any relatively modern God when what we are really concerned about is the end-result of their belief in God? Was Jefferson far wrong when he held that the worth of a man's citizenship was not gauged by his theology but by what he did?

On the other hand, some of us do not feel with that mighty nostalgia-victim, C. E. M. Joad (as he expresses himself in *God and Evil*), a need to acknowledge a power outside ourselves which can somehow compensate for a "world wallowing in evil." Why should we be thumped with sizzling condemnations in the ancient method, "Give a dog a bad name and hang him"? For those who have conquered (or sublimated?) their God-nostalgia, Fred G. Bratton convincingly rebuts Joad:

> The only consistent solution of the problem of evil is to divorce completely the arbitrary activity of the deity in the natural world, to regard nature as morally neutral, immutable, and to see in every evidence of adversity one of two things: man's free moral agency or the physical law of cause and effect. Considered from these two standpoints, there is no great mystery about suffering or about a flood or about an automobile accident, but some theologians still prefer mystery to realism.

Let those who will, choose mystery; let those who will, choose realism; let those who can, choose both. But all of us ought to choose good ends.

What is meant here is this: religious people today in general still stand with Paul's thesis in Corinthians, "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God. . . ." Our value as religious beings depends on our attitude toward a Something Other outside our narrow selves. Paul felt that the human being could be liberated from the narrowness of his ego only through a transcendent God. And yet some world religions have held, and an increasingly large number of Western people hold, that there is no proof—most of all no statistical proof—that

an individual's theological belief inescapably defines his social attitudes and limits his contributions to our common human brotherhood. What the problem we are dealing with demands is an adequate psychological exploration; and that exploration has not yet been entered upon by competent authorities.

But such a study would probably indicate just what comparative religion and practical American politics seem to say. That is, the job for theists and non-theists is to recognize the values common to both of their positions and to strive together to advance those values. Indeed, here is just the way we Americans do act. It is tacitly assumed under the American principle of separation of church and state that all citizens can work toward certain goals in spite of theological differences. Both a Jesuit and an atheist must recognize the constructive value of brotherly love. And in and for that love they have frequently worked together in certain social aims.

When the theist insists that without God no human can do anything constructive, that man must have a Transcendent Other, he forgets that for countless millions a non-metaphysical transcendent *has* served a religious purpose. In so far as religion is a doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly in the way of human brotherhood, all that the religious individual needs as an incentive to religious works is a Something Other outside the self and its narrow interests. A practical transcendent can serve the same values a metaphysical transcendent encourages.

A hint of this possibility is seen even in the claim of Baron Friedrich von Huegel that a sound philosophy can have no explanation of evil. Evil, he insisted, is a "dread reality." He found that the only thing to do with it is not to explain it, but to overcome it, or, if that be impossible, to endure it.

The conquest of evil, like the love of some high cause, can be a Something Other sufficient as a religious transcendent.

In other words, does not the twinge of God-nostalgia find its noblest answer in a common cause in which either the theist or the non-theist can "forget himself into immortality"?

The Mind of Thomas Jefferson

LEONARD B. GRAY

Thomas Jefferson was one of the most cultivated men of his day. He was aristocratic, scholarly, reserved, retiring, unostentatious. He did not mingle intimately with the common people as did Abraham Lincoln. He did not write for the newspapers as some of his great contemporaries such as Alexander Hamilton did. His only book was *Notes on Virginia,* of which only two hundred copies were printed and distributed among a circle of carefully chosen friends. He was, at least until he became President of his country, a poor speaker, and seldom made a speech inside or outside of legislative halls. John Adams said that during his whole time in Congress he never heard Jefferson utter three sentences together. In short, Jefferson possessed few of the characteristics of a typical public figure and he made no efforts to win public attention or favor. Yet the common people of his day loved and trusted him. And his influence upon history is tremendous and immortal. Today he is generally regarded as one of the greatest of Americans, and some fine minds regard him as our greatest. These facts are both an evidence of and a tribute to the essential greatness of our third President. They bear witness to the true instinct of the masses of Jefferson's day and to the unerring judgment of posterity. They show us once again that, in the main, fine attitudes and great deeds speak louder than striving for effect or a multitude of words.

"Yes, the people," to use Carl Sandburg's great phrase, can be relied upon. The people, in whom Jefferson like Lincoln believed and in whom Hamilton did not, can be trusted in the long run to choose the best values and the best leaders. The people knew that the dominant passion of this great Virginian was for freedom and that he had pledged himself to fight every form of tyranny over the mind of man. They knew well his deep, unfaltering trust in them. His faith in their essential goodness and in their ability to set things right inspired them to live up to his faith in them. His faith in them drew back to himself their faith in him. Yes, the people, said this great humanitarian, are to be relied upon.

Today how grateful we are that such a man as Jefferson appeared on the American scene in the beginning of our history as a republic! We know that the roots of our American democracy were largely in him and in his type of mind. Lawyer, mathematician, inventor, expert mechanic, astronomer, architect, musician, farmer, botanist, paleontologist, zoologist, anthropologist, geologist, legislator, natural philosopher, writer, and educator, he was as versatile as Benjamin Franklin. It is not generally known today that he was the first man to put plow-making on a scientific basis. And many other fine marks on his record are little known. His was an inquiring mind, a well-stored mind, a universal mind. Like Bacon and Goethe, he made all knowledge his field in which to roam and to feel at home.

We agree with Marquis de Chastellux, a French aristocrat, who visited him in the spring of 1782 that from his youth Jefferson had placed his mind on an elevated situation even as he had his great house at Monticello. And we would seek to find the steps by which one of the most versatile and capacious minds that ever existed climbed to such an elevation.

Through both his parents young Jefferson was bred to a profound culture in the sense that Matthew Arnold used the term, implying a passion for perfection. His father, Peter Jefferson, was physically and intellectually a superior man. By sheer strength of will and hard work this pioneer frontiersman had mastered the practical art of surveying and became the most successful surveyor in Albermarle County. From him his son acquired the large estate, Shadwell, and a considerable library, and better still a sense of responsibility, self-reliance, and love for learning. From his mother, Jane Randolph, an aristocrat through and through, Thomas received refinement and love of beauty and the arts. On canoe trips down the Rivanna or stretched under an oak tree, this rare boy pored

over Homer and Virgil. Music became his favorite passion and often the youngster would play his violin three hours a day. And he became familiar with the languages of forty Indian tribes.

Never had the old Virginia college, William and Mary, known such an inquisitive student as young Jefferson. At first he gave himself to a gay social life in which he developed a certain foppishness. But after his first year he settled down to hard work, often studying fifteen hours a day. His avid mind had an appetite for everything from Greek grammar to Newtonian physics and calculus, from Plato which he read in the Greek to Ossian, the rude bard of the North, who early became his favorite poet. He studied Anglo-Saxon to get at the roots of the common law. The most determining influence that came up against his mind at college was Dr. William Small from Scotland. In the classroom the youth learned much from this professor of mathematics and profound student of the various branches of science. But he acquired much more from the personal friendship of this "enlarged and liberal mind," as Jefferson later called him, and from the many high conversations he had in the home of his great teacher.

There at college Jefferson developed a type of mind that loved truth and accepted nothing on hearsay, a type of mind that was never to leave him. Our student was interested in everything and absorbed everything, but Bacon, Newton, and Locke became his favorite authors. In his student days he acquired the tastes, interests, and attitudes that were to make him our only philosopher-President. He was building the mind that many years later was to stand out in such sharp contrast to the mind of Alexander Hamilton. This striking contrast began to show itself in the following incident: The two men were dining at the home of Vice-President John Adams. The brilliant, self-confident Hamilton was dominating the conservation as usual. Presently Adams voiced the opinion that with a few abuses corrected the British would be the most perfect constitution of government ever devised by the brains of man. With its defects the British is the most perfect, Hamilton stoutly asserted. Jefferson thought that both views were dangerous nonsense. What with a corrupt Parliament, most of the land owned by a comparatively few landlords, and suppressed press and opinion, he thought that there was precious little self-government or equality in England. And then looking around at the portraits on the walls of the room Hamilton asked: "Whose are they?" "The portraits of Bacon, Newton, and Locke," said Jefferson, "and they are my trinity of the three greatest men the world has produced." Hamilton was thoughtful for a time and then burst out in his dogmatic manner: "The greatest man that ever lived was Julius Caesar." Thus each mind took the measure of the other. No wonder that these two great minds were soon to clash, that these two men were soon to become two of the bitterest opponents in all history.

Jefferson was not adapted to the practice of law. He was too much of a legalistic philosopher for regular practice. His inquisitive and speculative mind was too much given to ideas. He had little taste or skill for public speaking and rough-and-tumble fighting. And yet through his strenuous efforts and his rare charm of personality that easily made friends, he became a successful lawyer during the short time he practiced. The law, he admitted to John Bernard years later, was not without its part in his development. It gave him, he said, a view of the dark side of humanity. And then he added that he had to read poetry to qualify this dark view with a gaze on the bright side.

In his day Jefferson was accused of deriving most of his ideas from foreign sources, especially from the French. And today I frequently talk with people who believe that his political philosophy was largely shaped by French influence. Now to be sure, as John Dewey says, French influence was unmistakably stamped upon him. And yet we ought also to bear in mind that much that he saw in France influenced him against that country and its government. His universal mind did glean from almost every field of thought. He chose his favorite authors from many lands and literatures. Bacon and Locke strengthened his natural passion for reason and truth. But for all the many influences that played upon him, his mind was chiefly American-made. It was his American mind that derived his affirmation of human rights from his Saxon forefathers whom he thoroughly studied. The Anglo-Saxons, he learned, had established their principles of liberty and natural rights of man before they settled in England. The English-speaking peoples had lost their natural birthright under a long series of abuses such as feudalism, monarchy, and caste. And now our great democrat would revindicate and restore the "happy system of our ancestors" on a new soil.

Jefferson's religious heterodoxy came not from "French infidels," as his enemies asserted. Not a single quotation from Diderot, Voltaire, and Rousseau can be found in his notes on religion. Rather his liberal religious views came from a typically American mind that thought for itself. They came from his independent and thorough study of the teachings of Jesus which he claimed were the best system of ethics ever devised by the mind of man. They came from his respect for individual freedom and natural rights of man which moved him to claim that it was wrong to force a person to pay taxes to support a church or a religious teaching in which the taxpayer did not believe. They came from his belief in a wise and benevolent God and from his hatred of Calvinism which he said was worse than no belief in God.

See this country gentleman now at the age of thirty-two! He is cultivated, wealthy, and happily married. He is considered the most learned man in Virginia. Tall, bony, broad-shouldered, surprisingly slender, hair red-brick in color, temples bushy, eyes deep set and quizzical, face aglow with intelligence and good will, full of health and virility, he is a striking figure. He speaks with a low, well-modulated voice, always on the conversational level. He can calculate an eclipse, plan an edifice, survey an estate, try a cause, tie an artery, break a horse, dance a minuet, and play his beloved violin. He entertains a lot. He is exceptionally popular. Life for him is song, laughter, and zest. He hugely enjoys it. But for all his joyousness he is reading books that take him farther and farther afield in new realms of thought, thinking deeply and seriously—an enlightened liberal, talking more and more of "inherent" and "natural" rights. Already his mind is formed, set in the direction it will travel henceforth. To be sure, some of his convictions are to be strengthened. After forty all that he sees in France is to strengthen his conviction that every form of govern-

ment excepting the republican is at open or secret warfare with the rights of mankind. Visiting the huts and eating the food of the French poor are to deepen his sympathies for the downtrodden masses. At sixty he is to be more liberal than he is now. But his mental twig is definitely bent in the way that it shall grow. He is now an aristocrat whose sympathies are chiefly with the humbler folk, an intellectual trusting implicitly in the goodness and intelligence of the common man. Such a well-stored and matured mind, with its love for human rights and its rare power of expressing itself in writing, is adequately prepared for one of the greatest tasks ever assigned to him or to any man. One year from now he is to measure up to his great assignment.

Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, Robert Livingston, and John Adams were appointed a committee to draw up the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson with his "peculiar felicity of expression" was naturally chosen by the other members to compose the Declaration. In a stuffy parlor on the second floor of a bricklayer's house on Market Street, Philadalphia, from June 11 to June 28, 1776, this young man of thirty-three secluded himself. What great days those seventeen were!! Tirelessly his pen scratched. Carefully he chose each word, carefully he carved and polished each sentence, seriously aware that each counted as indeed it did. With the precision of his scientific mind he produced the fine, clear, meticulous script. The work was personal and unmistakably his. But it was much more than his, for he aimed to make it and did make it the voice of his compatriots and the expression of the American mind. This great second sentence! History knows no other words more loaded with dynamite than these:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Here was something new in the history of political doctrine, another object for which governments exist! In the triplex of political values the writer substituted "pursuit of happiness" for "property." He laid the foundation for a unique commonwealth of justice, freedom, and security. On July 2 Congress approved the Declaration. It was read in Independence Square, Philadelphia. Copies were published in every community of the thirteen colonies that had suddenly been made states. Without knowing it the great mind of Thomas Jefferson had created an immortal.

Jefferson accomplished many great tasks as member of his state legislature, as member of Congress, as governor of his state, as our Ambassador to France, as Secretary of State, as Vice-President and President of the United States, and as private citizen. But it is clear what he considered his three greatest accomplishments, for he caused this to be written on his tombstone at Monticello:

> Here lies buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, of the statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and father of the University of Virginia.

And yet Jefferson's greatest contribution was his own type of mind. It was his faith in the worth and possibilities of people that was the fountain from which flowed each of the three contributions for which he wished to be remembered. And in turn it is his faith in people that will keep these three contributions alive. Always his love for truth, humanity, and freedom is attacked from within our borders and from without, and always we must defend this love if we would truly honor him and build a better world. It is his love for truth that will keep free inquiry alive. It is his love for men that will make the value of human personality dominant and judge everything by its power to serve the good of men. His mind in us will dedicate wealth, politics, science, industry, and every word and deed not to the hurt but to the welfare of man.

And now the release of atomic power with its staggering possibilities of affecting our daily lives for ill or good challenges us as we have never been challenged before to get the spirit of this scientist who loved man more than science and to dedicate all the power that nature puts into our hands for the enrichment of human beings. The greatest monument then that we can build to our first great democrat is to develop his type of mind. To erect this monument is our supreme task.

Labor and the Veteran

DAVID M. BLOCH

How are the discharged soldiers reacting toward the many grave political, economic, and social problems confronting post-war America? Are the great majority of them pro-labor or anti-labor? Progressive or reactionary? These are momentous questions that labor, or those who are its principal supporters, cannot very well afford to ignore. There are more than seventeen million veterans in the United States, when we include the four million of World War I, most of them in the prime of life. For good or bad they are bound to exert a great influence and mold to a considerable degree the "shape of things to come." Without their moral support it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for any organized group to lay the foundation for a more civilized economy and lasting peace.

No one, of course, is wise enough to predict with absolute certainty how in the long run this great body of men, of all walks of life and various shades of thought, is going to line up politically—the kind of decisions it will make on the controversial issues of the day. By a close scrutiny, however, of past and present veteran activities, a fairly accurate conception can be had as to the destination the political winds are heading for: whether they are blowing in the path of liberalism or directing their course towards reaction.

To begin with, it is well to bear in mind that the new veterans have a rather bad legacy from their buddies of the first World War: The American Legion and the V. F. W. These major veteran organizations who, prior to America's entry in the late conflict, had a combined membership of more than a million and a half, if they are to be judged on their record are certainly no violent champions of true democracy. Neither of these organizations had ever fought for the rights of the underprivileged or interested itself in any way in the larger moral problems of our generation.

The Legion, in particular, at the very beginning of its appearance on the political scene, had been more or less antagonistic toward labor. Its officials had on various occasions publicly manifested their dislike for any group or individual who in any way dared to oppose the status quo. Pretending to be special guardians of law and order, the heads of this powerful organization have, under the guise of patriotism, time and again made a mockery of our Bill of Rights.

Nor can the progressive elements have too much confidence in the minor veteran organizations of which the most prominent are: The Disabled War Veterans, the Spanish American War Veterans, and the Jewish War Veterans.

The first two associations, whose total strength a few years ago was about 150,000, are very conservative and sectarian. Their adherents seldom allow themselves to be involved in matters of importance to the average citizen. The primary objective of the officers of both organizations is to procure the maximum benefits for their members.

Although the Jewish War Veterans organization, whose membership in 1942 exceeded 50,000, is a good deal more progressive and has done valuable work in the common fight against intolerance, it is far from being a genuine liberal outfit. Most of its executives are too much attached to the past, too staunch upholders of the competitive system to offer serious resistance to the powers that be.

It would be unfair to hold the ex-service men solely responsible for the indifference and hostility toward labor and libertarian ideas prevalent among the old veteran organizations. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s when many of these forgotten heroes faced hard times and sought aid from the government, most of the representatives of unionism and progressivism stood aloof and did practically nothing to assist the veterans in their struggle. Ignoring their material and spiritual needs those champions of labor allowed the veterans to shift for themselves. The truth of the matter is that most of labor's spokesmen in those fateful years were actually contemptuous of the men who bore arms.

But the cynicism and intellectual snobbery on the part of the liberals were entirely uncalled for. The greatest number of the men who fought "to make the world safe for democracy," at least so they were made to believe, were too young and, thanks to their elders, too uninformed to have fully realized what it was all about. It was therefore the solemn duty of the advanced guard of labor to enlighten the veterans, to gain their confidence, to help them fight their battles.

But the reactionaries were not at all backward in taking advantage of the situation. They were, figuratively speaking, "quick on the trigger." Rounding up the grieved men, they made sure that the organizations they joined were perfectly safe, that they would in no way conflict with the interests of Big Business.

Nor are there any indications that the old veteran organizations are losing their influence. From all appearances they are strengthening their position and becoming even more articulate. Since the termination of the war they have been carrying on an intensive campaign among the discharged G.I.s to induce the latter to join their ranks, and are meeting with a fair amount of success.

To make matters worse, the retrogressive forces have not only been doing their utmost to see that the veterans "stay put," but have utilized their entire propaganda machinery to poison the minds of these men against labor, racial minorities, and all radical or liberal groups. And judging by developments in the past six months or so, it can readily be seen that the efforts of the reactionaries were not altogether wasted. To cite but a few examples:

One of the C. I. O. officials in addressing wounded G.I.s at the Walter Reed hospital was frequently interrupted by jeers. Only after considerable effort did the labor leader manage to gain their confidence and proceed with his talk.

In the longshoremen strike 176 G.I.s, who because of the stoppage of work were prevented from sailing to the United States on scheduled time, sent the following wire from Europe to the Associated Press: "We volunteer to load, unload and service any ship that will take us home and we ask the privilege of handling any strikers in our own way. We know that any other unit will do the same."

This violent outburst by the men in uniform can by no stretch of the imagination be attributed chiefly to jittery nerves as a result of their anxiety to get home. The wording of the message definitely discloses their hostility toward labor. In true fascistic fashion those embittered G.I.s held only the workers responsible for the strike. The ship owners were not even mentioned.

When Harold Laski, the famous political economist and spokesman for the British Labor party, in a broadcast from London, rightfully criticized the Vatican for giving aid to the Fascists, he was venomously attacked by a representative of the Catholic War Veterans. He had the temerity to demand of Secretary of State Byrnes that Laski be barred from the United States.

And who of us is not familiar with the discriminatory acts by members of the Legion against loyal Japanese-Americans on the Pacific Coast during the War?

The cases cited can be multiplied manifold. The bias shown toward the Negro and Jew by both members and ex-members of the armed forces is a matter of common knowledge.

Unless there is vigorous opposition to counteract the barrage of lies against the democratic way of life, constantly spread over the air and in the press; unless considerable pressure is brought to bear on the old established veteran organizations to induce them to adopt a more liberal policy, the progressives are likely as in the past to be left "holding the bag." Many of the veterans, old and new alike, will either sink in the slough of political apathy or swing toward reaction.

Though from the glum picture presented thus far, the prospects of the G.I.s becoming Sir Galahads bent on ridding the country of corrupt politics, racial bigotry, and economic injustices are not any too bright, it still is a bit premature to pass final judgment. Among the many new associations recently founded by the returned G.I.s there are some that are genuinely progressive and moving in the right direction. The Veteran Action Committee, for one, is already taking a militant stand against all forms of reaction. While looking after the welfare of the discharged soldier, it is at the same time defending vigorously the rights of labor and civil liberties.

Even the Legion and the V. F. W. are showing some signs of awakening. Though still reluctant to make the necessary drastic changes in their constitutional by-laws to meet the challenge of the times, they are in spite of themselves forced to move slightly toward the left. Here and there members of various posts throughout the country are taking the initiative to compel the officials of these two organizations to take a more liberal stand towards labor.

But let us not delude ourselves. The veterans as an organized group, no matter how good their intentions, cannot be expected to take the lead in the coming struggle for freedom and world reconstruction. That is the function of labor or those in sympathy with its philosophy. Who else but the radical-liberal element can claim priority in the battle for liberty or social planning?

It should be clear by now, however, that without the veteran's support labor can accomplish but little. And labor is beginning to realize that it can no longer afford to ignore the veteran. In its press, articles and editorials frequently appear dealing with the many problems facing the veteran, and the C. I. O. is conducting an extensive educational campaign with good results. In the leading strikes many of the ex-service men are standing shoulder to shoulder with their union comrades on the picket line.

While these are encouraging signs, much more spade work and construction all along the line will have to be performed by labor if it is to receive the veteran's full support. For one thing, labor will have to put its own house in order by cleansing its unions and political affiliations of some of the abuses and undemocratic practices that have accumulated in recent years in both high and low offices of these organizations.

Labor must come to the veteran with clean hands. More than that, it must offer him something besides vague promises and glittering generalities. The ex-service man has no patience for such nonsense. The discharged G.I. wants above all to be rehabilitated as quickly as possible so that he can again take up where he left off when he entered the army and once more lead a normal, useful life. To be more specific, he feels that he is entitled to a well-paying job and all that goes with it.

Needless to say, that alone will not satisfy all the veterans. The more sensitive ones, especially those who have gone through the baptism of fire are clamoring for something besides material security. Restless and disillusioned, they want to be assured that the terrible ordeal they have gone through was not just another useless slaughter; that the brave new world envisaged by the democratic leaders was not just a mere chimera of their imagination. These veterans are desperately in need of a definite social philosophy to which they can cling—a philosophy rooted in idealism, yet not divorced from everyday reality.

Whether those who speak for labor will be able to meet these requirements remains to be seen. But there is hardly any doubt that unless they do, there is but slight hope for a peaceful solution and just settlement of the many conflicting problems confronting us.

It will be no easy matter, to be sure, to win the veterans over to labor or the liberal cause. Those of us who are on the side of the angels have learned through bitter experience not to be too optimistic. We have seen too often how the powers that make for righteousness have been outnumbered and outmaneuvered by the forces of evil. If reaction is not to procure a new lease on life, we will have to be on our guard as never before. We will have to cease following the gospel of expediency and become once more the impassioned crusaders for a new way of life. Only then can we hope to rally an influential number of the veterans to our side.

This certainly is not the time for dillydallying. Mankind is going through the most critical transition period in its history. It will require much strength, courage and wisdom on the part of labor to direct the historical pendulum along the right path. And time is running short. The atomic energy is with us to stay. Unless placed under proper control and utilized for constructive instead of destructive purposes this revolutionary discovery might well destroy what is still left of our boasted civilization.

Those who voice the aspirations of labor cannot afford, therefore, to remain quiescent and allow the powers of darkness to gather momentum and gain ascendancy. If the progressives are equal to the great task ahead of them; if they remain true to their rich heritage; if they coordinate their forces and act wisely and in time, there need be no fear of the final outcome.

Should they, however, fold their arms and fail to do their part, they will have only themselves to blame if disaster overtakes them and all hopes of a brighter future vanish into thin air.

What Do We Mean by Progress?

WENDELL THOMAS

The modern concept of progress, brought to a focus in the eighteenth century by the Abbé de Saint-Pierre, has been apprehended from two different standpoints. From the point of view taken by those who are now shouting "free enterprise" through newspaper and radio advertisements, progress is whatever occurs through the actual interworking of technology, private profit, and international war. From the human (or social) standpoint, however, progress demands the peaceful organization of technological advance for the common good. Voltaire and Immanuel Kant, C. H. Saint-Simon and Auguste Comte, Lester F. Ward and Arnold J. Toynbee have ably presented this point of view, but not so ably, perhaps, as Jean Jacques Rousseau, who based his idea of progress on early communal culture. It should be illuminating to recall Rousseau's position and develop it, even though briefly, through the similar outlook of Wilson D. Wallis, a contemporary American sociologist.

Rousseau, of course, was a heretic in more ways than one. While his eighteenth century contemporaries were either flourishing the new notion of secular progress or defending the doctrine of Christian Providence, Rousseau denied that mankind had, in point of fact, made progress during historical times. He did not deny that progress had taken place in the sciences or the arts. But he felt that these special advances were so tied up with the onset of private property in land and large social products that they merely emphasized inequality among men. As a result, the Arcadian sense of community in the natural world was left farther and farther behind as men grew in power, and with it all human, or democratic, progress. Rousseau admitted, however, that human progress could still be made if men would aim at the common good through natural education and a state based not on class and violence but on common consent and voluntary "convention."

There is much that is vague and confused in Rous-

seau, but his view of progress is subject to systematic interpretation: mankind describes a vast spiral—the end not yet actualized—from the simple community cradled in the natural world to a complex community likewise concerned with sub-human nature. In between these two states of peace we find a long period of inequality and strife which covers ancient, medieval, and modern history. How far progress in special fields compensates for the loss of peace and freedom, or how much promise it holds for the future, are questions which can hardly be answered. We can be sure of man's general progress only when the arts and sciences are made to serve a new peaceful community enjoying the natural world. Such a view corresponds to the Confucian spiral from the small realm of paternalistic peace in the past to the great realm of democratic peace in the future; to the Hebraic spiral from the original garden of Eden to the coming earthly kingdom of God; and to the spiral of the late L. T. Hobhouse, English sociologist, from the isolated primitive kinship group to the integrated world-wide realm of citizenship that is yet largely a dream.

Like a twentieth century Rousseau, Wilson D. Wallis throws down the challenge of peaceful primitive society to our bellicose civilization in his scholarly *Culture and Progress*. His first step is to clear away the illusion that non-historic societies are essentially different from ours. "Primitive culture," he declares, "is not so static as is commonly supposed. . . . Variations are common and, upon closer acquaintance, the supposed uniformity of individuals disappears." For confirmation he refers to Franz Boaz, who writes, "anyone who has lived with primitive tribes, who has shared their joys and sorrows, their privations and their luxuries, who sees in them not solely subjects of study to be examined like a cell under the microscope, but feeling and thinking human beings, will agree that there is no such thing as a 'primitive mind,' a 'magical' or 'prelogical' way of thinking, but that each individual in 'primitive' society is a man, a woman, a child of the same kind, of the same way of thinking, feeling, and acting as men, women, or children in our own society."

Wallis then quotes from another observer to show that primitive people, who are really like us, can surpass us in contentment through a peaceful adjustment to each other and to their natural environment. "Melville wrote regarding the valley of the Typees, in the Marquesas: 'In this secluded abode of happiness there were no cross old women, no cruel step-dames, no withered spinsters, no love-sick maidens, no sour old bachelors, no inattentive husbands, no melancholy young men, no blubbering youngsters, no squalling brats. All was mirth, fun, and high good humor.' "

Summing up his survey of primitive culture Wallis writes:

> Almost everywhere in primitive society the individual has skill in some aesthetic pursuit and devotes an appreciable portion of his time to the beautifying of objects or of person, and to ceremonialism. . . In many cultures social values are thus dramatically expressed. . . One is impressed also with the all-roundness of the savage. He recounts the origin of the world, the sun, and the stars; he relates the story of the creation of plants, animals, and men. . . He knows the physical features of his environment, its fauna and flora. . . He participates in the religious, economic. technological, aesthetic, ceremonial, and social phases of his culture to an extent seldom seen in our civilization. * * * There is little envy, and . . . little occasion for it. All share alike.

As compared with primitive society, Wallis remarks:

> . . . Civilization seems to have not only its growing pains, but its constitutional ailments, its vestigial remainders and horrid reminders. . . The goods of civilization seem always to ally themselves with proportionate evils. . . Legalized slavery passes but leaves in its wake other social industrial evils which in some respects are more malign and insidious. . . We have diphtheria and the cure for it; the savage has neither the disease nor the cure.

Wallis admits that in knowledge, organization, and sometimes individual freedom—all of which constitute power—civilization is superior to primitive life. But power, while necessary for progress, is not sufficient. "Granted that men shall have increased their power of influencing nature and of harnessing her to their service; that they shall have found new routes and new methods for traveling round the globe . . . that they shall have increased a thousandfold their knowledge of the stellar universe . . . they will not necessarily be nobler or happier, but only possessed of greater power which may be directed either to their enhancement or to their undoing."

It remains to be seen to what extent our power—notably, our now available atomic power—will be used to destroy us or to harmonize conflicts and create beautiful things. Progress is not mechanical or continuous; it depends upon us.

> Scientific knowledge forges ahead [says Wallis] but develops conditions, such as those exhibited in the industrial stage, which are worse than those of previous decades. . . . Advance brings specialization, and specialization causes frictions which in turn necessitate a new integration of old forces. . . It is a never-ending series of mistakes and corrections followed by further mistakes. . . Specialization develops new power and also new potential evil; the clash of powers leads to antagonisms, the friction which puts the brake on progress. Integration releases the brake by a redistribution of power, and a focusing upon new ends recognized as common.

The great need of our time is obviously for integration. While our purblind political leaders are calling hoarsely for increased national defense when there is no defense, and for keeping our destructive power secret when there is no secret, we should set our minds unflinchingly to the task of loving our neighbor nation—be it China or Japan, Germany or the Soviet Union—as we love the United States of America. And with integration we shall clearly recognize new ends as common: the new end of giving *everyone* enough to eat; and the new end of controlling the natural world not for exploitation but for beauty.

Ultimates

Engineers can build a dam and hold the water's flow,
But not distill the rain or manufacture crystal snow.
They pour the concrete, lay their pipes and build their dynamos
Then wait for power on secrets only falling water knows.

As rain that finds the earth and lends to man its willing hand
So truth and love and right are on their way in every land.
I need not build a universe in which they shall prevail,
But only make the channels used by laws that will not fail.

SHELDON SHEPARD.

The Virus of Victory

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

Victory no less than defeat may have its victims, and the penalties of triumph may be as severe even if not so obvious as those of failure in battle. Whereas the vanquished may feel the thrust of the conqueror, the winner may be threatened by some subtle betrayer within himself—and often, in the long perspective of history, this betrayer proves more damaging than a foreign foe.

These are facts which, one fears, we in America may soon learn to our irreparable cost. We may find that there is a virus in victory, tending to result in a perverted psychology among the leaders of a country if not in its people. This follows almost naturally from the nature of the human mind, and the tendency of men to swagger and to feel overbearing pride when they gain any great unexpected success. It is illustrated by the chip-on-the-shoulder attitude of the schoolboy who finds that he has a stronger punch than other ten-year-olds; and it is illustrated, likewise, by the history of most countries that have emerged with banners flying after a long or difficult bout of warfare.

A few examples may be in point. In ancient Egypt—one of the most peaceful of countries before the invasion of the Hyksos during the Eighteenth Dynasty—a warlike spirit developed following the expulsion of the invaders; Egypt became militarized; an army under Thutmosis I overran Syria; the chariot and the scimitar (adopted from the old enemy) became part of the equipment of the Pharaohs, and the common man for a while eagerly embraced the military profession. In a word, Egypt absorbed some of the worst faults of her detested adversary.

A similar state of mind appeared in ancient Greece. In the war against Persia, Sparta was the acknowledged leader, the acknowledged center of military resistance. But following the defeat of the invader, Athens became inflated with a martial spirit such as she had never known before; she began to develop her empire, which meant that she must necessarily be a military and naval power; and this in turn led toward the catastrophic Peloponnesian war. Here again, as in the case of Egypt, the virus of victory was disastrous.

In Rome also, though that state appears to have been belligerent from the beginning, the growth of the spirit of military conquest is to be noted following the Punic wars. And, in modern times, the conquests of the Spanish empire brought an increasing atmosphere of military rapacity, checked only by events such as the debacle of the Grand Armada and the reverses in the Netherlands; the naval successes of the English stimulated an epidemic of piracy, euphemistically known as "privateering"; the victories of the Swedes encouraged the sword-swinging attitude of Charles XII, who ended by losing his army and barely escaping with his life in the Russian campaign of 1708-09; the triumphs of the French Revolutionary armies in pre-Napoleonic days brought an expansion of the military spirit which made it possible for the apostles of the "rights of man" to stain half of Europe crimson beneath the banners of the bloody Bonaparte. In more recent days, we have seen the spread of Prussian militarism following the victories manipulated by Bismarck in Denmark, Austria, and France; we have observed Japanese militarism, a generation or two ago, expanding beneath the eclat of successful warfare against China and Russia; we have watched how the Chinese themselves, though traditionally among the most pacifistic of peoples, have developed such a pugnacious mood in the long conflict with Japan that two armies have engaged in a large-scale civil war.

Whether we realize it or not, this all has a close bearing upon events in our own America. We may feel that we are not a military people by inclination or tradition—and, on the whole, we are not; we may argue that we did not become militarized after the first World War, but on the contrary reacted against all things military—and this also is true, though our part in that conflict, great as it was, was only a small fraction of our share in its successor. But the fact of chief importance is not the traditional attitude of our people, nor even the present-day outlook of the great unvocal millions; the fact of chief importance is the position of our leaders, their perspective and conduct, and the direction in which they point. For it is the leaders who feel the flush of an overwhelming victory far more than do the masses who have merely suffered to make that victory possible; it is the leaders who may have their heads turned and their vision warped, as in the case of their innumerable predecessors in many lands since the day of ancient Egypt; it is the leaders who will fix our policy, bind us by their irrevocable deeds, and plant the crop of greatness or ruin that will be reaped before another generation is over.

What, then, is the position of our leaders? Have they been able to escape that chip-on-the-shoulder attitude, that arrogant inflation of the ego, and that purblind and swaggering self-reliance which have made victory for many a nation as costly as defeat? Unfortunately, there are signs that they have not resisted the lure; that they have set out upon the trodden and calamitous historic path.

Both within the military and the civilian administration, the evidence for this conclusion is abundant. It is apparent, first of all, in the legal fiction, supported by our elected officials no less than by the army and navy, that the war has not yet ended although we have long ago celebrated V-E Day and V-J Day (and let us not forget that the legal fiction throughout history has been the mask for the obliteration of free institutions, leaving the form without the substance). Thanks to this fabrication of the law, the army and navy have been able to retain virtual wartime authority though the war has terminated in every way except in legalistic language; the army and navy have been able to keep millions of men in uniform, many in regions as remote from any former war theatre as India, in direct violation of the spirit of the conscription act and the purposes for which universal service was allegedly sought. Incidentally, the widely circulated claim of lack of shipping space for troops stationed abroad has been proved to be false, since dozens of potential troop carriers have been lying idle for long periods in San Francisco Bay and other harbors.

Similarly, the army and navy have retained control over gigantic supplies of badly needed materials (so much so that the San Francisco *Chronicle* recently displayed pictures of sections of mile-long warehouses at Lathrop, California, where thousands of tractors have been aging while home-builders have been unable to

obtain a single bulldozer). By the same token, the army and navy have continued wartime censorship, as when recently the reports of a hurricane at Okinawa were delayed about a month, though there was no enemy whom the information could have benefited. Furthermore, the army and navy, with the implicit view that their desires are paramount even in peacetime over the requirements of the civilians whom the armed forces were brought into being to serve, have had no apparent thought at all of the dislocations they cause in civilian life.

Thus in San Francisco, which is so jammed with a war-bred population that housing accommodations are unavailable for multitudes of needy families, the demands of a naval station have brought in thousands of new residents, so further complicating one of the direst housing crises in the history of America. And thus again—to return to the retention of manpower by the armed forces—while the civilian population has struggled along with a drastically curtailed supply of physicians and dentists, the army and navy have hoarded thousands of these acutely needed professional men, for no reason that anyone has been able to explain. And going far beyond these usurpations, in the direction of the extirpation of civilian liberties, is the army-sponsored atomic control bill that would put the most vital instrumentality of the age completely beyond normal influence, throttle free scientific research, and establish the dictatorship of a small appointed group that could act in secret beyond fear of regulation even by the President or Congress.

So much for the purely internal phases. In its foreign aspects the dominance of the military arm is even more alarming. Connected with these aspects (since no one alleges that vast reserves will be required to put down internal disturbances) is the conscripted peacetime army demanded by most military leaders, regardless of the fact that we have no ostensible enemy to fear, and that the atomic bomb has made it unlikely that any army will be of much avail in a future war. Do we not here see an undisguised attempt of the army to magnify its power?—an attempt which, if successful, may not only overturn our democratic institutions, but may incur such hostility and suspicion abroad and such a competition in armaments that further fighting may follow almost automatically? In the same category is the military and naval desire to obtain strings of far-flung bases—bases which would be threats in the face of foreign nations, and particularly of Russia; bases whose utility, to say the least, would be questionable in an age of ocean-vaulting rocket planes and of atomic bombs. As if to indicate in what manner the bases might be employed, certain features of recent army policy stand out in sinister relief: our cooperation in the British-Dutch attempt to smother Indonesian independence, by permitting the use of American weapons (from which, however, the labels must be piously removed!); and our virtual participation in the Chinese civil war on the side of the Nationalists—certainly an end no American civilian had envisaged in submitting to the shipment of troops abroad, and just as certainly a step with possibilities of boundless complications, not the least glaring of which is a conflict with Russia.

The situation would be ominous enough even were the military not aided and encouraged by the civilian administration. It is serious when our President and Commander-in-chief accepts the army's estimate of its own needs for conscription; it is not less serious when the executive apparently makes no determined effort to check the exactions of the military, its monopolizing of men and materials, its censorship, its transparently hypocritical utterances, its gun-pointing attitude that has already besmirched the name of the United States in the Far East. But perhaps the most serious of all is the position of a government that seems more than half reliant upon the strength of its own striking arm, more than half determined to take a one-power course in international politics.

Only on the ground of excessive dependence on our own military strength—our military strength as represented in particular by the atomic bomb—can one explain the American failure to call an international conference after the unloosing of the most portentous weapon in all the history of frightfulness. Only on this ground can one account for the talk of "keeping the secret"—this in the face of the unanimous agreement of scientists that there is no secret which can be kept for more than a few years, and in defiance of the ghastly certainty that our secretiveness will stimulate an atomic bomb race, whose final phase no man may survive to witness. Moreover, only on the ground of a secret military exclusiveness of purpose can one interpret the fact that "well over ninety per cent of the effort" currently being devoted to the atomic bomb is "given to produce bigger and better bombs for an undefined purpose. President Truman regards this as a sacred trust."

It is true that, on the other side of the ledger, some concessions have recently been announced by President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee, with the idea of placing the atomic bomb under control of the United Nations, subject to certain restrictions. But the actual concession is more apparent than real, since a single dissenting member can veto any decision of the United Nations (incidentally, we have given no guaranty that we ourselves will not be that member). In other words, we have become so confident of our own military supremacy that we have made no serious effort toward internationalizing and thereby neutralizing the atomic bomb. And yet no unbiased onlooker can doubt that internationalization is the only pathway of relative safety in a world where even a small nation might dominate the earth through its superiority in the energy of the split atom.

Probably it is still not too late in the day. If we really awaken to what has been happening, and to the shadow of military dominance that is subtly and insidiously spreading over us, we may be able to check the process before we have drifted into disaster. Nonetheless, we must remember the many countries where the process was not checked, and where the ramparts and barracks of vast military autocracies arose to disfigure once-peaceful landscapes; we must remind ourselves that the problem, grave as it would have been in any era, is critical beyond words in our own time, since modern weapons have rendered life upon this planet incompatible with militarism and that expansion of warfare to which militarism inevitably leads. It may conceivably be that the fate of the world—and not merely the survival of civilization but the continuance of the human race itself—will depend upon whether we in the United States curb the demands of military-minded leaders, and take up that staff of a peaceful control which is needed as never before. The decision is ours to make. But already we can hear the undertones of catastrophe. Shall we not heed the volcano's rumblings before the cone blows off in the most cataclysmic explosion of all time?

The Study Table

Beginnings of Unitarianism

A HISTORY OF UNITARIANISM: SOCINIANISM AND ITS ANTECEDENTS. *By Earl Morse Wilbur. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 587 pp. $6.00.*

Dr. Earl Morse Wilbur has presented us with a definitive work on the early beginnings of the Unitarian movement. It is a scholarly book written for scholars. Here one finds detailed the source material on the ideas and activities of those sixteenth and seventeenth century heretics who laid the basis for the growing movement of freedom, reason, and tolerance in religion. Starting with the Anabaptists and coming down through the lives of such men as Servetus, Laelius Socinus, Ochino, and Faustus Socinus, Wilbur traces minutely the fortunes and misfortunes of these three principles.

The sub-title of the book is much the more accurate. It might better have been called "The Rise and Fall of Socinianism." The only justification for calling it a history of Unitarianism is the fact that it is the first volume of a projected two or three volume series and it does show the beginning struggles for freedom, reason, and tolerance. However, they are often glaringly absent in the attitudes exemplified towards others on the part of those who demanded them for themselves.

To be thoroughly informed on the early history and beginnings of the Unitarian movement one must read this book. Also one fervently hopes for the early publication of the succeeding volumes.

RANDALL S. HILTON.

Books Received

FLORENCE AYSCOUGH & AMY LOWELL: CORRESPONDENCE OF A FRIENDSHIP. *Edited with a Preface by Harley Farnsworth MacNair. Published by the University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 289 pp. $3.75.*

HE SPEAKS AGAIN. *By George Parson. Published by John W. Luce Co., 30 Winchester Street, Boston, Mass. 16 pp. $2.00.*

INSPIRATIONAL AND DEVOTIONAL VERSE. *Compiled by Bob Jones, Jr. Published by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 336 pp. $2.50.*

LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT PAST. *By Jack Finegan. Published by the Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J. 500 pp. $5.00.*

THE LIGHT IS STILL SHINING IN THE DARKNESS. *By Kirby Page. Published by Kirby Page, La Habra, Cal. 124 pp. 50 cents.*

THE MEANING OF HUMANISM. *By Curtis W. Reese. Published by the Beacon Press, 25 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 53 pp. $1.00.*

NOW IS THE TIME TO PREVENT A THIRD WORLD WAR. *By Kirby Page. Published by Kirby Page, La Habra, Cal. 123 pp. Paper edition $1.00. Cloth-bound volume $2.50.*

101 INSPIRATIONAL POEMS. *By Jean Connie Keegstra. Published by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 92 pp. $2.50.*

The Field

(*Continued from page* 18)

Because of the importance of the project and the quality of the youth involved we expect to draw to the faculty of this Encampment a distinguished group of teachers and leaders of affairs, who will be experts in their fields, and capable of living with, studying and thinking through the problems with which the younger generation should be most concerned. The list of visiting speakers, lecturers, and seminar teachers will include men from the State Department, the embassies, men and women from the great organizations which have been carrying the responsibilities of citizenship so effectively: Foreign Policy Association, Institute of Pacific Relations, League of Women Voters, Union for Democratic Action, Cooperatives, and so on.

The program will include the necessary squad work on the tasks of living together (bed-making, K.P. and the like); intensive study during the morning and early afternoon; sports during the balance of the afternoon. There will be trips to the Greater New York area to industries and government offices, taking advantage of the rich cultural opportunities of the city. Evenings and weekends will be given over to social gatherings: dances, movies, forums, walks and talks, and rest.

The Encampment will be located on the grounds of the Fieldston School at Riverdale, New York City. The school has fourteen acres and seven buildings. There are marvelous facilities for sports: swimming pool, gymnasiums, outdoor playing fields, and tennis courts. There are kitchens and a dining hall. Double-decker bunks will be provided for sleeping.

Although there will be financial expense in organizing the project, in making it known throughout the country, and recruiting staff and students, the cost of the Encampment per student will be paid in part by the campers, or by their sponsoring organizations, or through a general scholarship fund. We believe many churches, settlement houses, "Y"s, schools, Cooperatives, unions, and other agencies will be glad to send their most promising young people and pay for them as part of their leadership training.

Such an encampment, held successfully and effectively one summer, might become traditional. Over a period of five years, a thousand young people of leadership ability, coming from every section and walk of life, will have lived together, will speak a common language, will have certain basic common objectives, will be clear in their democratic purposes, informed on the issues, strong and intelligent in strategy, and capable of the responsibilities of citizenship and leadership. They will recognize Fascism and other anti-democratic movements. They will be clear on the essential issues of civil liberties, the minorities problem, the labor problem, the agricultural problem and international relationships. They might be capable of making democracy work here at home, and of helping make the United Nations Organization work in the world.

This project will, of course, have careful evaluation and follow-up and will be carried on each summer for the next five years. It is hoped that from it will flow a renewal of the "Work Camps for Democracy," with camps established eventually in various parts of the United States and Latin America, and other parts of the world.

— — — — — — — — — — — — —

Encampment for Citizenship,
2 West 64th St., New York 23, N. Y.

I am interested in your Encampment for Citizenship and will be glad to help in the following way(s):

1. By publicizing this project. ———

2. By providing one or more scholarships of $100 each. ———

3. By contributing toward the general scholarship fund. ———

Name .....

Address .....

Correspondence

Excellence Qualified

To UNITY:

That was an excellent contribution toward the Palestine question made in your February issue by Miriam Ziony. But why spoil so generally fine an article with two statements toward the end that can hardly be called "factually accurate"? Is it really true that, as Miss Ziony writes, "the Pope more than once has declared himself in behalf of the Jewish homeland"? May I ask which Pope, when, and where? On the contrary, it is a well-established fact of Zionist history that the Pope and the powerful church he represents have at no time expressed themselves favorably on the subject of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. A few, very few, Catholic leaders, yes, but never a Pope or any responsible "official" of the hierarchy, unless I am badly mistaken.

Also, is it not a bit exaggerated to state that "with the help of American Jews . . . every one of the European Jews could be taken care of in Palestine now in temporary shelters," etc.? There are today something like a million and a quarter or a million and a half Jews in Europe. Does Miss Ziony really mean that all of these could be accommodated in Palestine NOW? An excellent article has its excellence qualified by these quite unnecessary exaggerations.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

Brooklyn, New York.

Comments on "Our Too Masculine World"

To UNITY:

In response to the reprints of my article, "Our Too Masculine World," published in the December, 1945, issue of UNITY, so many interesting letters have been received that it occurred to me that the readers of UNITY might be interested to read some of the thoughts and reactions to the article as expressed by a few whose opinions are well worth consideration.

From Judge Anna M. Kross, Chairman of the Youth Conservation Committee, General Federation of Women's Clubs, came the following letter:

> Thank you so much for sending me your article, "Our Too Masculine World." I agree with you one hundred per cent. But what are we going to do about it? That is the question that must be answered if the women in America are to play an effective role in bringing sanity to the world. If you have any suggestions to make I would be delighted to receive them.

A letter from Mrs. Frances M. Pollak, Assistant Director to Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, Acting President of Americans United for World Organization, Inc., pleased me very much:

> Mrs. Harriman has asked me to acknowledge your interesting letter and enclosed reprint which you recently sent her in care of this office. Of course, we believe that women have an active role to play in the cause of world peace, if they can be sufficiently aroused to the importance of their contribution—but how?

Miss Gertrude Baer, influential German peace advocate, who has been a refugee in this country for many years, wrote me: "Thanks for your untiring and magnificent efforts in the interest of women and peace."

A good word came from Mrs. Vira Whitehouse, National Chairman of Woman's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace, from whose letter I quote: "I have been most interested in your article, 'Our Too Masculine World,' and wish indeed that every woman could read it."

Mrs. Alice Park, well-known feminist of the Pacific Coast, wrote me: "I like your article very much—I like its title also. I note the beginning and the conclusion and agree with the whole article."

Mrs. Annalee Stewart, Co-Chairman of the Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription, said: "I surely agree with you on the important part women should play in the *will to peace* and will use illustrations from your article for my talks." And from Mrs. Annie E. Gray, who succeeded Mrs. Fanny Garrison Villard as Director of the Women's Peace Parley, after World War I, came the word: "I hope the reprints may be widely distributed to newspaper editors, magazines, and similar publications and to unconverted persons."

The men have not been as outspoken as the women in commending my article, though my pacifist friend, the Reverend Henry W. Pinkham, encouraged me to write the article when I first thought of it, suggested its significant title, and since its publication has written me: "Thus the light you have helped to kindle here and there is spreading and burning brighter."

Another clergyman, well known in New England, wrote: "I wish to say how much I enjoyed and appreciated that article and I do not seem to find anything to which I can offer disagreement. It leads logically up to the climax—the outlawry of war. There is no other conclusion if civilization is to continue. It should have wide publicity." A poetess of New England said: "It is one of the most timely and splendid articles on the subject that I've seen and I am in thorough accord with it." And a news commentator in Washington wrote, "You have done a fine job."

One man wrote me that although he would have to admit the truth of my article he did not like to admit that men were incapable of running the world properly but were obliged to ask assistance of women in matters of government in order to create a society of decency and peace—one fit for human beings to live in.

Another man took issue with almost everything in the article though he did not deny the truth of the seven "Facts." But he held that women are no more opposed to war than men are and that society and governments would be no better if women had shared responsibility with men or had managed affairs alone. Also that women exerted as much influence on men as men upon women. So I felt obliged to refer him to an authority on sociology, Lester F. Ward, author of *Applied Sociology*, (p. 79):

> Among these [erroneous world views] I would put first, as having exerted the most baneful influence on the human race, that which I have described in *Pure Sociology* as the Androcentric World View. It is not so much the terrible suffering that womankind has had to endure in consequence of this gigantic error as it is the dwarfing and stunting influence that it has exerted throughout such a prolonged period. We can scarcely form an idea of what the human race would have been if a true and just conception of both men and women had always prevailed. And as this false world view still prevails so universally as to render it a veritable world view still even today, we can realize that there is something for applied sociology to do.

I could go on but think I have given enough to show the prevailing spirit toward the article on the part of its readers and will close with a quotation from the letter of a psychologist who is also an M.D., recently released from army service:

> A copy of your article is received. I agree wholly with your thoughts as expressed in it. Our androcentric society had its beginning in primitive times through phallic worship which was the forerunner of all later religions. For this reason the supposed superiority of the male animal has been perpetuated. . . . So deep rooted in our society is this totally barbaric idea through primitive and superstitious religion that it cannot be hoped to see a very marked change for several centuries to come. However, there is hope in the ever-increasing importance that psychology and scientific metaphysics will play in human society in the future. We are not likely to be influenced by primitive superstition as much as were our ancestors.
>
> What I would like to see established and which I am hopeful enough to believe will eventually come as an absolute necessity, is a system of psychological and metaphysical research and administration similar to the medical profession. Such a profession, unbiased by religion and superstition, with its research laboratories and practicing personnel could help in the gradual re-education of human society toward a better understanding; and out of such moral and spiritual understanding would evolve that ideal anthropocentric human fellowship necessary for lasting "Peace on Earth; good will toward men," that we have all been vainly looking for.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

Brookline, Mass.

Fog

Not easy to understand
The voices of the fog
That talks
With wet slurred tongues
Beneath
A vaguely drifting veil.

GENEVIEVE K. STEPHENS.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

HONOR ROLL

The official figures from the United Appeal Headquarters as of March 15 listed the following Western Conference churches as having gone over the top on the Appeal goal.

Alton, Ill.
Evanston, Ill.
Geneva, Ill.
Moline, Ill.
Hobart, Ind.
Kalamazoo, Mich.
St. Louis, Mo.

It is known that other churches have also exceeded their quota but the money has not yet been paid in. This list, therefore, will be considerably longer next time.

THE JOY DINNERS

As a part of the special events connected with the United Appeal ten dinners will be held throughout the United States. The principal speaker will be Dr. Charles R. Joy, Director of the Unitarian Service Committee. Dr. Joy has just returned from spending the winter in Europe and gives a telling eye-witness account of conditions. Four of these dinners are to be held in the Western Conference, at Indianapolis, Detroit, Chicago, and Omaha. In addition, a special Mass Meeting is to be held at the People's Church, Chicago, with Dr. Frederick M. Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, and Dr. Preston Bradley, Minister of the People's Church, as speakers.

SOLD

Pattern on the Mountain, the Lenten Manual for this year, compiled and written by Dr. E. Burdette Backus, Indianapolis, has been completely sold out. By the beginning of Lent all three printings were gone. Lent provided the occasion for issuing this little volume of readings and meditations but people have recognized that they are of real value at all times.

PIERRE VAN PAASSEN

Many churches have written in asking for Dr. van Paassen. A letter from him informs us that he is completely booked through May. These requests will be kept on file and we will do the best we can in meeting them if Dr. van Paassen should be able to make a tour for the American Unitarian Association next fall.

SPECIAL OFFER

UNITY is offering a special subscription rate to the members of churches in the Western Conference. Write the Conference Office about it. We hope that those who receive it as a gift from the Conference will urge their friends to subscribe.

THE MEANING OF HUMANISM

The long awaited book, *The Meaning of Humanism,* by Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President of the Western Unitarian Conference and Editor of UNITY, is now available. An adequate supply is on hand at the Conference Office. Order your copies now. Price $1.00.

HINSDALE

Robert S. Turner, minister of the Unitarian Church of Hinsdale, Illinois, has for some time been showing movies for children on Sunday afternoons. Lately there has been an admission charge of canned food. The children have crowded the capacity of the church. Now two other churches in Hinsdale have asked for the movies to be shown to the children of their churches. The same admission is charged, and all of the food goes to the Unitarian Service Committee.

DELEGATE CARDS

Notice of the Denver meeting of the Western Conference was sent to the minister and clerk of each church. The delegate cards were included in the letter to the clerk.

Remember—early reservations on trains to Denver would be helpful. Side trips can be arranged. Write the Conference Office.

UNITARIAN HISTORY

A History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and Its Antecedents, by Earl Morse Wilbur, is again available. It has been out of print for several months but the new printing has been received. Copies can be ordered through the Conference Office. Price $6.00.

LESLIE PENNINGTON

Last month we reported that Mr. Pennington was speaking at Rollins College. While there at the convocation, the school conferred upon him the honorary degree of L.H.D.

MELVIN ARNOLD AT DENVER

Mr. Melvin Arnold, Director of the Division of Publications of the A.U.A., will attend the annual sessions of the Western Unitarian Conference at Denver, May 31 to June 2. He will speak at the dinner on Saturday evening, June 1.

Among the other speakers at the various sessions will be Mrs. Frank B. Frederick, of Boston, Carl Storm, Leslie Pennington, Curtis W. Reese, E. T. Buehrer, and W. H. Hutton. The programs will be out soon.

Railroad reservation from any point to Denver can be made through the Conference Office. The Burlington, Missouri Pacific, and Rock Island lines are cooperating in making these arrangements.

LAKE GENEVA

The rates at the Lake Geneva Conference, August 18-25, will be $21.00 and up, depending on accommodations desired. The initial fliers are out now. The programs should be out soon. Make your plans NOW.

WESTERN CONFERENCE

Annual Meeting—May 31 to June 2—Denver, Colorado.

Summer Assembly—August 18 to 25—College Camp, Lake Geneva, Wisconsin